



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,755	06/18/2001	Pavitra Subramaniam	OIC0198US	1735
60975 7590 01/11/2008 CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP 11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE BLDG. H, SUITE 250 AUSTIN, TX 78758			EXAMINER RIMELL, SAMUEL G	
			ART UNIT 2164	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/11/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/883,755

Applicant(s)

SUBRAMANIAM ET AL.

Examiner

Sam Rimell

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,10-13,24,26-30,33-36,47 and 51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-7, 10-13, 24, 26-30, 33-36, 47, 51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.



**SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2164

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-13, 24, 26-30, 33-36, 47 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson et al. Pre-Grant Publication 2005/0050477 in view of Official Notice).

Claim 1: FIG. 4 illustrates a search template that can specify a search category of “**business units**” and an employee name. The search request is processed to produce the initial output of FIG. 4.

As seen from FIGS. 3 and 5, the template is also configured to perform a supplemental search in which an organization identifier “**management**” can also be entered. The entry of the organizational identifier “**management**” corresponds to the determining of the organizational identifier by the computer. The organizational identifier of “**management**” would be identical to the organizational identifier of any given user belonging to management.

A supplemental search is then performed of database records (col. 0049, lines 4-8) corresponding to all the entered search criteria, and which produces the output of FIG. 5.

The output of FIG. 5 illustrates that a set of organizational identifier records were selected (set 502) that match the organizational identifier “**management**” and a set of category records are selected (set 504) that match the specified search category of “**business units**”. A final selected subset of records is “John Doe”, which intersects both sets of records and is a subset of both the organizational identifier records and the category records.

Robertson et al. differs from claim 1 in that it does not specify that the first user as entering an organizational identifier to which the user belongs. However, examiner takes Official Notice that the skilled artisan would readily recognize that any user entering a search could in fact search for their own organization or their own name. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have “John Doe” as the claimed “first user” where John Doe enters his own name and organization identifiers, as would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill.

Claim 3: In FIGS. 3-5, the first user enters search criteria that includes keywords, such as “John Doe”.

Claim 4: The search category “**business units**” is listed in the box (306). The box (306) is a drop down menu of items which are readable as an index.

Claim 5: Any of the items listed in the box (306) are readable as “business components”. For example, the “**business units**” or “**management**” are business components.

Claim 6: Whenever any of one of the business components from box (206) are selected, a logical view of database tables appear. For example, in FIG. 3, when the “**management**” business component is invoked, a logical view (308-1→308-5) is displayed which represents a logical view of management data derived from a database (col. 0049). In an alternative interpretation, examiner takes Official Notice that the data within the database can be represented by an entity-relationship diagram, a well known and standard tool used in database design. Entity-relation diagrams are also logical views of data tables contained within a database. Each entity within the diagram represents a table. Under such alternative interpretation, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Robertson et al. so as to further include

Art Unit: 2164

views of entity-relation diagrams in order to provide the user with a more detailed view of data tables contained within the database.

Claim 7: The user interface (304) permits the entry of search criteria.

Claim 10: In FIG. 5, the data instance of “John Doe” matches both the search category “**business units**” as well as the organizational identifier “**management**”.

Claim 11: Paragraph 0049 describes the execution of queries against the database based on entered search criteria “John Doe” and organizational identifier “**management**”.

Claim 12: Paragraph 0029, last line, indicates that the server which supports the database can be an SQL server. Such SQL servers inherently process queries in the SQL language specification.

Claim 13: The search results are the results produced after clicking the “Go” button. For example, the logical view of data (502) and (504) shown in FIG. 5 is one of many examples of such search results.

Claim 24: See remarks for claim 1.

Claim 26: See remarks for claim 3.

Claim 27: See remarks for claim 4.

Claim 28: See remarks for claim 5.

Claim 29: See remarks for claim 6.

Claim 30: See remarks for claim 7.

Claim 33: See remarks for claim 10.

Claim 34: See remarks for claim 11.

Claim 35: See remarks for claim 12.

Art Unit: 2164

Claim 36: See remarks for claim 13.

Claim 47: See remarks for claim 1.

Claim 51: See remarks for claim 11.

Remarks

Applicant's arguments and amendments have been considered.

Each of claims 1, 24 and 47 have been amended to delete the step of performing a search of databases for records corresponding to the search criteria. This exact same step is then added back into the each of the claims. Deleting and adding back in the exact same step does not change the scope of a claim, does not overcome any rejection and does not advance prosecution.

Each of claims 1, 24 and 47 have been further amended to recite that the organizational identifier is identical to the identifier for some given first user. In Robertson, this would be true for any user belonging to "management".

This office action follows an RCE request and is made non-final.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sam Rimell at telephone number (571) 272-4084.



Sam Rimell
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2164